



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,688	07/30/2001	Marcos Teres	10001329-1	2187

7590 03/13/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
QIN, YIXING	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,688	Applicant(s) TERES, MARCOS	
	Examiner Yixing Qin	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

In response to applicant's amendment received 2/2/06 all requested changes have been entered.

Response to Arguments

After carefully considering the arguments, the Examiner believes there is discrepancy in the interpretation of the Hamilton and Maekawa references cited by the Examiner. After analyzing the references again, the Examiner believes that the Maekawa reference would make a better primary reference since the Examiner believes it does indeed teach/suggest the features of a database and of electronically transmitting a report. As clearly seen in the applicant's drawings in Fig. 7, one of the places that the report can be electronically transferred to is a display 21. The Maekawa reference discloses in Fig. 21-22 and column 12, lines 47-67 that these figures show a display of analyzed information. Either of these figures would read on a report since they summarize the findings of the CPU in the diagnosis of error in the printer. Please see the new rejection below for more details.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

I. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,386,271 – "Maekawa").

1. **Claims 1, 13, 19**

Art Unit: 2622

- Maekawa discloses in column 5, lines 57-68 and column 6, lines 1-12 the communication of conditions of a copying machine to a CPU 91. (i.e. **communicating present symptoms**).
- Maekawa discloses in Fig. 25 a chart disclosing various conditions and measures to be taken to alleviate those conditions. Again, the Examiner would like to focus on Fig. 25 of Maekawa. This table is a database since it stores a collection of information. One can see that columns 2 and 3 contain a condition number and a description of that condition. Column 4, "conclusion" is a list of printer malfunctions. In fact, column 15, lines 21-42 discloses the use of the rule weight column of Fig. 25 (i.e. probabilities) to calculate the probability of one or more malfunctions occurring and taking the appropriate steps to remedy the malfunctions.
- Maekawa discloses in Fig. 16 the processing of a CPU in the center of the control system (column 2, lines 64-65).
- Column 11, lines 51-58 and column 12, lines 1-50 discloses the various processing that can occur. Column 12, lines 47-62, especially, discloses the cause of trouble (i.e. can read on **description of symptoms**), possibilities and measures to be taken are displayed (i.e. **most appropriate malfunctions are reported to user**). As mentioned above in the arguments, the displaying of information (e.g. on a monitor) reads on electronically transferring a report to a service technician. Although it is not explicitly disclosed that this report is transferred to a technician, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention for a technician to be looking at the displayed report. The motivation is that the technician is the one who would take the appropriate steps to remedy malfunctions on a copier or printer.

2. Claim 5

- This has been addressed in claim 1, where the copying machine sends data to the CPU 91 in response to diagnostics.

3. Claim 6

- Maekawa discloses this in column 15, lines 21-23, where a user informs that an "image is faint."

4. Claim 7

- This has been addressed in claim 1, where the copying machine sends data to the CPU 91 in response to diagnostics.

5. Claim 9

- Although Maekawa discloses the displaying of a report, it does not explicitly disclose the sending of the report to a printer service facility. The Examiner, however, believes the transfer of data (the report in this case) through a communications connection such as a LAN or the internet is well-known and

Art Unit: 2622

believes it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill to send the report to an appropriate location.

6. Claims 10, 18

- One can see in Figs. 21 and 22 of Maekawa that there are probabilities of a certain fault occurring. This essentially acts as a recommendation since a high probability indicates that that fault is more likely to occur and needs more attention than a fault with less or no probability of occurring.

7. Claim 11

- Maekawa, discloses in Fig. 21 that a measure to be taken can be exchange.

8. Claim 12

- Maekawa discloses the use of a telephone network as a means of communication. One of ordinary skill knows that the Internet is a well-known means of communication that could be accessed using a plurality of devices.

II. Claims 2-4, 14-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,386,271 – “Maekawa”) in view of Hamilton et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,200,958 – “Hamilton”)

9. Claims 2, 15

- Maekawa does not explicitly disclose the recording of symptoms in a log. However, the secondary reference, Hamilton discloses in column 7, lines 65-68, that faults are recorded in a fault log. Both references are in the art of error diagnosis in a printer environment. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include an error log. The motivation would be to see exactly which errors occurred on a particular printer.

10. Claims 3, 4

- Hamilton discloses in column 8, lines 18-22 that the diagnostic can identify faults within the “...image input, image output, and image manipulation services.”

11. Claim 16

- Please note the discussion of the second limitation of claim 13 above. Although it is not explicitly stated to compare the error log, it would make sense to one of ordinary skill in the art to do so since error logs provide detailed explanations of errors that have occurred.

12. Claims 14, 20

Art Unit: 2622

The system of claim 13, where

- **the processor is directly or indirectly linked to the printer system.**
- As discussed in claim 13, the CPU is in the "center" which is linked to the system through a telephone network.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yixing Qin whose telephone number is (571)272-7381.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on (571)272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

YQ